

REMARKS**Summary of the Claims**

The Office Action mailed October 15, 2004 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-41, and 43-64 were pending in the application. Claim 1, 7, 22, 23, 30, 31, 37, 52, 53, 60, 61, and 63 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-11, 13-41, and 43-64 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative sincerely thanks examiner Tran and SPE Bella for the courtesy of a productive telephone interview conducted on January 6, 2005. In the interview, the amended features in the pending independent claims were discussed with respect to the applied prior art. Applicants representative pointed out the differences between the these features and the applied prior art as discussed further herein.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-11, 13-41, and 43-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,461,708 to Kahn (hereafter "Kahn"), in view of U.S. patent 5,701,400 to Amado (hereafter "Amado"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed in the interview, the pending independent claims recite, *inter alia*, that the report data used to automatically generate the graphs includes report data derived from a previous report created by a different application and the report data does not include any previous data used to create the previous report. These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art.

Specifically, as already discussed in prior replies and prior interview, Kahn does not relate to automatically generating graphs from *previous reports created by a different application*. Kahn relates to generating graphs in an application based on data that is present

or accessible within the same application, for example, based on a user selecting blocks of data within the same application. Therefore, Kahn does not disclose the claimed automatic generation of graphs, in an application, based on report data and a report format of a previous report (created by a different application) in which the report data does not include any previous data used to create the previous report. Therefore, at least these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by Kahn.

Neither is this deficiency of Kahn cured by Amado. Specifically, all the cited portions of Amado disclose storing the diagnostics and raw data in separate databases so that they are linked together such that the raw data supporting a diagnostic can be conveniently retrieved. However, nowhere does Amado disclose that, in an application, the format of a previous report (created by a *different application*) is identified so that graphs can be *automatically generated* based on the identified format of previous report and the report data in the previous report itself such that the report data does not any previous or raw data used to create the previous report. If the examiner is maintain the applied rejection, applicant respectfully requests the examiner to point out where the recited features in the independent claims is disclosed by either Amado or Kahn.

Accordingly, neither Kahn nor Amado and, therefore, neither their reasonable combination, discloses or teaches the features recited in the pending independent claims. Accordingly, the pending independent claims are patentable over the applied prior art.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully request entry of the instant amendment since it is believed to place the application for condition for allowance. Furthermore, applicants submit that the instant claims amendments further define features that had already been presented in the prior reply and discussed with the examiners in the prior interview with the examiners. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims,

the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 18, 2005
(Tuesday after holiday)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee
William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874
Aaron C. Chatterjee
Registration No. 41,398
Attorneys for Applicant